



2016

Tucson-Pima County Historical Commission

Plans Review Subcommittee

LEGAL ACTION REPORT

Thursday, April 14, 2016

4th Floor Conference Room, Joel D. Valdez Main Library,
101 N. Stone, Tucson, Arizona 85701

1. Call to Order / Roll Call

Meeting called to order at 12:05 p.m. and a quorum was established.

Commissioners Present: Terry Majewski (Chair), Jim Sauer, Michael Becherer, Helen Erickson, Patsy Waterfall, Arthur Stables.

Staff: Frank Dillon, Michael Taku, Jonathan Mabry (PDSD)

2. Approval of Legal Action Report and Summary of Minutes for 3-24-16

Motion by Commissioner Erickson, duly seconded by Commissioner Waterfall to approve the Legal Action Report and Summary of Minutes of 3-24-16.

Motion passed. Voice Vote 6-0.

3. Rio Nuevo Area Review Cases

UDC Section 5.12.7

- a. RNA-16-09** Diocese of Tucson- Parish Hall and Historic Wall Demolition - Case for "No Reasonable Economic Use" and Replacement Plan - 192 South Stone Avenue, (Downtown Core Subdistrict).

Staff Dillon summarized the history of the demolition scenario. Staff noted applicants will be presenting the new design to the Design Review Board (DRB). Staff Mabry reminded Commissioners that the issue was no economic use and replacement plan.

The project was presented by Richard Fe Tom and Kegan Tom, Architects, The Architecture Company. The Diocese of Tucson was represented by Most Rev. Gerald F. Kicanas, Bishop of Tucson; John Shaheen, Steff Koeneman and Larry Lang.

Part One, The Case for “No Reasonable Economic Use”.

Lead presenters Architects Tom and Tom highlighted the two scenarios. Scenario 1 is to leave the Parish Hall “As-Is”, construct a new 4-Story Conference Center; construct a 147-car parking structure to serve the needs of the proposed Conference Center. This scenario is expected to cost \$19,911,188

Scenario 2 is to demolish the Parish Hall to construct new Conference Center and construct a new 4-Story Conference Center. This scenario is expected to cost \$18,603,825.

Based on this Cost Analysis between scenario 1 and scenario 2, it shows that the difference in cost is \$1,307,363 in favor of scenario 2 herein.

In term of Use Analysis, the Diocese contends that Scenario 1 is a duplication of functions; physical disconnect between buildings, cost prohibitive, lack of funding and does not address or meet the functional requirements of the Diocese and Parish. Therefore, this scenario is “unusable”. Accordingly, Scenario 2 connects the buildings, revitalizes the placita, removes blight, enhances Ochoa Street with the historic wall and funding is attainable. Therefore, scenario has economically reasonable use.

The applicants’ view of “no reasonable economic use” in the application was debated by the Subcommittee resulting in diverse opinions. Some members held that reasonable economic use was possible with the Historic Parish Hall and Historic Wall not demolished but rehabilitated. While others felt that sufficient evidence was presented to support the case that the Parish Hall and Historic Wall had no reasonable economic use to the Diocese.

There was a consensus among the Commissioners that deterioration of the historic Parish Hall may be attributed to insufficient maintenance by the property owner, Diocese of Tucson.

It was moved by Commissioner Stables, duly seconded by Commissioner Becherer to recommend approval of the case for “no reasonable economic use” of the Parish Hall and Historic Wall as presented.

Motion Split Vote. Voice Vote 3-3.

Part Two, The Replacement Plan Concept.

Lead presenters Architects Tom and Tom discussed the concept of a potential replacement plan for the Parish Hall and partial Historic Wall should Mayor and Council decide to approve the demolition request.

The Subcommittee review was guided by the principles of the design standards in UDC Section 5.8.9. Staff clarified that these standards do not apply in the RNA overlay zone, but the review and recommendation may be guided by their principles. These principles are as follows:

Alterations or additions shall properly preserve the historic and architectural characteristics that make it unique, and any changes or additions shall conform to the intrinsic and unique character of the building or structure itself.

Additions to a contributing property within an HPZ shall reflect the architectural style and characteristics of the existing structure. The property may be renovated to an earlier historic style that applied to the property.

New construction shall reflect the architectural style of, and be compatible with, the contributing property located within its development zone.

Heights of principal structures in the project's development zone are used to compare to proposed new construction of, or additions to, principal structures. Additions are to be no higher than tallest contributing property.

Additions to a contributing property shall be consistent with the proportions of the existing structure and with the prevailing proportions of Contributing Properties within its development zone.

Projections and recessions of a contributing property, such as porches, steps, awnings, overhangs, entrances, and windows, shall be appropriate to the style of the existing structure.

Architectural details of a contributing property, such as cornices, lintels, arches, grill work, shutters, window and door trim, and canals, shall be appropriate to the historic style of the existing structure.

Size, mass, and scale of alterations or additions to a Contributing Property shall be compatible with the existing structure and with the Contributing Properties within the development zone.

The proportion, pattern, and rhythm of openings of additions or alterations to a contributing property shall be compatible with those of the existing structure and with those of contributing properties in its development zone.

It was moved by Commissioner Sauer, duly seconded by Commissioner Waterfall to recommend denial of the replacement plan concept due to incompatibility in rhythm, massing, height, projections and recessions, details and treatment of historic wall on Church and Ochoa Street. And, in the event that Mayor and Council decide after public hearing to approve the application for demolition, the applicant returns to PRS for review of the replacement plan.

Motion carried. Voice Vote 5-1.

4. Current Issues for Information/Discussion

a. Minor Reviews

Commissioner Sauer updated the Subcommittee on minor reviews at West University on the Infill Porch and Broadway Village titles and fence.

b. Appeals

None at this time.

c. Zoning Violations-Compliance Update

Staff continues to assist owners on abatement of violations in the City Historic Districts and Rio Nuevo Area. Window violations cases in West University are being closed for compliance with appropriate materials.

d. Review Process for Approval of Complex Large-Scale and/or Multi-Phase Projects.

Staff provided information on Trinity Presbyterian Church boundary amendment and requested a special meeting. Subcommittee opted for a staff presentation at the next meeting. Subcommittee asked staff to include Draft revisions to the Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings as an Agenda item for the next meeting.

5. Call to the Audience

John Burr from Armory Park Neighborhood Association (APNA) informed the audience that APNA does not support the proposed demolition of the

Parish Hall. Mr. Burr stated that the applicants intentionally did not provide information about this position by the Neighborhood.

6. Future Items

Staff informed that PRS will be very busy in months ahead as there are many upcoming cases from West University, Barrio Historico and Armory Park.

7. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 2:20PM.